



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,833	07/25/2001	Svend Erik Borgesen	030307-0201	3884
7590	09/15/2005		EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. IVER P. COOPER 624 NINTH STREET, N.W. SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			STIGELL, THEODORE J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	
DATE MAILED: 09/15/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/911,833	BORGESEN, SVEND ERIK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Theodore J. Stigell	3763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,5,11 and 13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-10,12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/1/2003 6/13/2002 10/18/2003

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

The Examiner has acknowledged the Applicant's election of Species A and agrees that claims 1,3,4,6-10, and 12-17 are readable on this species. The Examiner also acknowledges that with the Applicant that catheter 2 is disclosed as being a reinforced catheter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,3,4, and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knute et al. (4,903,707). Knute et al. disclose a ventricle drain comprising a sealing means for providing an aperture through a skull and a catheter (19) having a free end and an end (33) reinforced for insertion into the aperture and an inserted body (59); the sealing means comprising a fixture (17) with threaded fastening means with a conduit defining a passage to the aperture, a seal (49,51) for sealed engagement of the catheter and adapted to have a first and second shape corresponding to a first and second position of the fastener, and a fastener (45) for securing the fixture to the catheter to the fixture. The passage through the fixture has two end parts both with a larger radial size than the intermediate size of the passage with the two end parts decreasing in size towards the intermediate part.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 9,10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knute et al. (4,903,707) in view of Penny (5,395,352).

Knute et al. disclose a ventricle drain that includes all of the limitations as recited in claim 1. Knute et al. does not teach to use a valve with three ports on the free end of the catheter. Penny discloses a y-adaptor with three ports. Penny teaches to use a y-adaptor to provide a fluid tight seal to prevent backflow and allow flow of fluid introduced into the body. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the ventricle drain of Knute et al. with the y-adaptor of Penny to make a ventricle drain that is less susceptible to backflow and allows for fluid flow into the body.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1,3,4,6-10, and 12 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1,3,4,6-10, and 12 of copending Application No. 10/333777. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has evoked sixth paragraph, means-plus-function language to define Applicant's invention in claims 1,9, and 10. If this is not the intention of the Applicant, appropriate correction is required.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theodore J. Stigell whose telephone number is 571-272-8759. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Theodore Stigell